



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IS THE GOTHIC BIBLE GOTHIC?

(Continued.)

THE HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RELATIVE PRONOUN IN THE GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

The relations of the Gothic relative to the other Germanic languages will be discussed and also its relations to the Greek. This will require many pages. After these materials are presented we shall turn to the discussion of a number of other constructions which suffer under the suspicion of Greek influence.

In primitive Germanic there was no relative pronoun, but there were two distinct forms of statement which expressed the relative idea that correspond to the two forms used in modern English. First form: "There is a man at the door [, *he*] *wants to see you.*" Second form: "The house *you see yonder* is mine." In the first form there are two independent sentences which lie side by side. From this fact comes the name of this form of statement—parataxis. In the second form the words *you see yonder* are evidently dependent. They essentially modify the word *house*. These words form a subordinate clause, but in this primitive form of statement there is as yet no formal expression of subordination. This form of subordination without a formal connective to indicate this idea is called asyndetic hypotaxis. In the oldest Germanic languages parataxis and asyndetic hypotaxis are still in wide use, but in the different languages there is a tendency to give a formal expression to the idea of subordination by the introduction of a pronominal form which is called a relative pronoun. Also parataxis is today often replaced by hypotaxis, i. e., one of the originally independent clauses assumes the form of a dependent relative clause: "There is a man at the door *who wants to see you.*" Modern thought is not so simple as older thought, it is inclined to

subtilities. The connective,—the pronoun—inserted in the first form belonged from the very beginning to the second proposition, i. e., the one in which it now stands, while in the second form it belonged originally to the principal proposition and later was transferred to the subordinate clause. In the first form the pronoun was often and may still be unexpressed. The subsequent development of the first form is quite simple and needs little explanation. The development of the second form, on the other hand, is quite complicated, hence the further discussion is largely confined to its various forms and transformations in the different languages.

In oldest Germanic the asyndetic hypotactical relative clause assumed two different forms. In the first type there is in the principal proposition usually a substantive preceded by the definite article, or there is a simple demonstrative without a substantive: "In droume sie in zelitun den weg *sie faran scoltun*" (Otfrid I. 17. 74) "In a dream they (the angels) told them the way *they should go*." "Ahleof ða se gomela, gode pancode, / mihtigan drihtne, þæs *se man gespræc*" (1397-8) "The old man sprang up, thanked God the mighty Lord *for what the man had spoken*." As can be seen by the English translation modern English cannot in this sentence employ the old constriction, as the lack of inflectional forms has somewhat limited its use. By changing, however, the words somewhat, we can almost always make use of the old construction when, as here, the case relation of the unexpressed relative is the accusative: "He thanked God for the words *the man had spoken*." In the Old English example the demonstrative is in the genitive, but it may in all the different languages be in the dative or any other case: "Bistú nu zi wáre furira Ábrahame, / ouh *thén* (dative pl.), man hiar nu zálta?" (Otfrid III. 18. 33-4) "Are you indeed greater than Abraham or those *we have just mentioned*?" It is common here among grammarians to call the demonstrative a relative and say that it is attracted into the case of the demonstrative. There is, however, in such cases no relative pronoun at all. In spite of the lack of a formal

expression for the relative idea the conception of a restrictive relative clause is perfectly clear, as can be seen by the English translation, which preserves the old form unimpaired. This old form has remained firmly fixed in modern colloquial English, but for some reason the construction has almost disappeared when the case relation of the unexpressed relative is the nominative. In the older languages, however, there is no tendency to avoid the nominative here: "zi dheodom dhem *euwih biraubodon*" (Isodor X. 1-2) "to those peoples that robbed you." "Bigán tho druhtin rédinon den sélben zwelif théganon, / then, *thár umbi inan sazun* (Otfrið Iv. 10.2-3) "Then the Lord began to speak to the twelve followers, those *who sat there about him*." It is very important to observe here that the second *then* is still not a relative. It is also not possible to say that the relative is attracted into the case of the preceding demonstrative. It is simply the common repetition of the demonstrative found so often elsewhere. The demonstrative stands at the end of the clause, so that it can point forward to the following asyndetic relative clause. Otfrið's own accents indicate clearly that this repeated form is of a mere formal nature, as it is not accented. This reduction of accent marks the first stage of development in the direction of a relative pronoun. In other passages we also find accented forms which still have the *force* of demonstratives. This common repetition of the demonstrative is also very common in English, often with full accent: "Bring me *the* (unaccented) new books, *those* (accented) I bought yesterday." This example only differs from the O. H. G. sentence in that the case relation in English is the accusative, while in O. H. G. it is the nominative. The *construction* in the English example is absolutely identical with that in the German example. Once the nominative could also be used in English. In studying all similar sentences it is important for those who speak English to start with an example containing the accusative relation, then the nominative form is readily understood. The predicate relation is also well preserved in English: "I am not the man *I was*." Of course, this relation

is also found in O. H. G.: "Ih bin iz réhto der *thu quis*" (Otfrid IV. 19, 53) "I am indeed he, the very individual *you say I am*." The O. H. G. construction is here again in the old typical form. The demonstrative *der* appears at the end of the principal proposition to repeat and here also to strengthen the pronoun *iz* and to point to the following asyndetic relative clause *thu quis*.

As can be seen in the examples in the preceding paragraph, the *first type* of asyndetic hypotaxis is most common in O. H. G. It is not found at all in Gothic and Old Norse. It occurs only rarely in "Beowulf." It seems quite probable, however, that it was a colloquial form in Old English, much used in everyday life but little used in literature as it is today. Later it was widely used in the written language. A rather full history of this construction in English will appear in the January number of the Journal. In modern German it only survives after the demonstrative *der* when the demonstrative points to a definite individual: "Ach! der (a definite individual) *mich liebt und kennt*, ist in der Weite" (Goethe). Die (nominative) *ich meine*, heisst Frau Findelklee" (Hauptmann's "Versunkene Glocke," Act. 2, 1. 1047). As the case relation in the second example is the accusative, this construction is also common in English: "The woman *I mean* is called Mrs. Findelklee." This construction is quite common in modern German in predicate clauses: "Du bist nicht, der *du scheinst*" (Fulda's "Talisman" 1. 4). The punctuation in the German examples shows clearly that the demonstrative is now regarded as a relative pronoun. The true relation will become apparent upon careful study and reflection. Thus in this last sentence *der* is the predicate, a demonstrative that stands at the end of the principal proposition pointing to the following asyndetic relative clause. Elsewhere in German the asyndetic hypotactical clause disappeared about the beginning of the seventeenth century from the literary language.

Quite similar to the *first type* of the asyndetic hypotactical relative clause described above is the *second type*. Some adverb

is added to the regular form of the first type. The adverb used varies in the different languages. In Old English *þe* and *þær* are used: "Lig ealle forswalg, / gæsta gifrost, þara ðe þær guð fornam / bega folces" ("Beowulf," 1122-4) "Fire the most greedy of spirits, devoured all of those *the battle had there snatched away from both peoples.*" Here the adverb *þe* is added to the demonstrative *þara*. It is difficult to define the exact meaning and force of *þe*, as it is no longer used and modern speech-feeling cannot come to our assistance. Much has been written on the subject of its etymology, but nothing absolutely positive has been brought to light. Some seem to regard it as a relative pronoun, others avoid the term pronoun and call it a relative particle. One thing is clear, it is not declined. It is much used in Old English, but is wanting in exactly the same expressions in O. H. G. As is seen by the translation given above, modern English also drops it, but otherwise preserves the construction faithfully just as it was written by the author of "Beowulf." Some etymologists regard it as an old locative of a demonstrative, so that it might mean *there*. Indeed, it may be replaced in Old English by "*þær*" *there*. "Him wæs bam samod / on ðam leodscipe lond gecynde . . . oðrum swiðor, / . . . þam ðær *selra wæs*" (2196-9) "The land belonged to these two among all the people, to one of them rather more, the one *who was nobler.*" This same adverb is found in O. H. G.: "Ni lasut ir, thaz thie dar *tetta fon annaginne gomman inti wib tetta sie*" (Tatian 100.3) "You have not read that he *who in the beginning made man and woman made them.*" As the adverb *þær* and *dar* are still widely used in modern English and German it is easy for us to approach this construction with our feeling. Thus we can analyze the German sentence as follows: "Ni lazut ir daz: thie (subject of second tetta) dar—tetta fon annaginne gomman inti wib—tetta sie" "You have not read this: That one there—he in the beginning made man and woman—made them." In Old Norse the adverb *er* or *es* is used in much the same way: "ef vin átt þanns (þann es) þú vel truir" (Hóvamöl," (44.1) "If you

have a friend *you thoroly trust*, lit." "A friend that one there *you trust thoroly*." The *es* is here translated by *there*, but its etymology is not entirely established. It does not seem to be essentially different in meaning from *þær* or *dar*. In Old Norse the adverb is regularly used, while in English and German it may be dropped and the simple form or first type be used. In Old Norse the first type has disappeared.

In course of time the two types of asyndetic relative clause described above underwent a gradual transformation. The demonstrative passed from the principal clause and became a relative in the subordinate clause. It once pointed forward, it now points backward. This transformation is nicely illustrated by the following examples: "*ðær gelyfan sceal / dryhtnes dome se þe, hine deað nimeð*" ("Beowulf," 440-1) "There to God's judgment must bow the one *death seizes*," or more literally, "that one there, *death seizes him*." The texts usually place the comma for metrical reasons after *dome*, but this obscures the meaning and the historical development so much that the comma has here for a clearer syntactical view been restored to its proper place after *þe*. Here *se* is the nominative of the demonstrative, the subject of the principal proposition, not the object of the verb in the subordinate clause. It is placed at the end of the principal proposition along with the demonstrative adverb *þe*, so that both forms may point forward to the following asyndetic relative clause. In the following sentence the demonstrative has become a relative, as can be seen by the fact that it does not take the case required by the verb of the principal proposition, but the case required by the verb of the relative clause: "*þæs þe þincan mæg þegne monegum, / se þe æfter sincgyfan on sefan greoteþ / hreþerbealo hearde*" (1341-2) "as it may seem to many a warrior who like the king grieves in his heart over this great sorrow." The punctuation is here that of the texts and corresponds to the facts. The texts treat these two entirely distinct constructions as one, namely, as a relative clause with a relative pronoun, while in fact the construction is sometimes asyndetic without a relative, sometimes a real relative clause

with a relative pronoun. In a large number of cases, however, it is impossible to determine with absolute certainty whether the form is a demonstrative or a relative. As can be seen from the examples given above, the demonstrative stood at the end of the principal proposition. Only an imaginary line separated it from the subordinate clause. Thus in the following sentence there is no formal sign that can absolutely settle the quality of *der*: "Ni ward ther thar funtan, *ther* wolti widerstantan" (Otfrid, II., 11.27) "The man was not to be found who would resist." Some grammarians say that where there are correlatives, as here, the second form is a relative. This is carrying modern ideas into the older stage of the language, which did not know such a rule. It seems more probable that the correlative grew up out of a repetition of the demonstrative, as found here. It may, however, easily be true that in this particular sentence the repeated form has already come to be felt as a relative. The case of the form is the nominative, the case required by the verb of the relative clause, but the case form required by the verb of the principal proposition is also the nominative, so that there is here no formal characteristic by which we can settle the question. The form repeated is often evidently a demonstrative: "Ni intwirit wórolt ellu thes wiht, thes ih thir zéllu" (ib. II., 12, 30) "The whole world will not disprove any of these things, these things I am now about to tell you." The repeated form *thes* is a genitive and hence belongs to the principal proposition, and is thus clearly a demonstrative. Later German abandoned this old demonstrative construction and used the relative here. The later use of the accusative here clearly marked the form as a relative as it is the case form required by the verb of the relative clause. In English, on the other hand, the demonstrative construction is still a favorite here in colloquial language: "Please, reach me that book, that one your hand is resting on." The criterion of case which usually decides the question whether the form is a demonstrative or a relative fails us utterly in the second asyndetic type wherever the inflected demonstrative does not stand at the end of the principal

proposition or at the beginning of the relative clause: "Gemunde ða ða are, þe he him ær forgeaf" ("Beowulf," 2606) "Then he thought of the present which he had formerly given him." Here the inflected demonstrative *þa* is separated from the uninflected adverb *þe*, which so often accompanies it with the force of *there*. These demonstrative forms seem to be used exactly like the two inflected demonstrative forms discussed above, but there is one formal difference. Here the second demonstrative is an uninflected form. As this form is uninflected we cannot tell whether it stands at the end of the principal proposition as a demonstrative pointing to the following asyndetic relative clause, or whether it is a relative. This uninflected form is not only found with a preceding demonstrative pronoun or article as in this sentence, but it is also found entirely alone: "Nu scealc hafað / þurh drihtnes miht dæd gefremede, / ðe we ealle ær ne meahton / snyttrum besyrwan" (ib. 938-42) "Now a retainer has with the help of God performed the deed which we all with all our wisdom were not able to perform." Does *þe* here stand at the end of the principal proposition pointing to the following asyndetic relative clause, or is it a relative? Has this construction developed out of those described above or is it an old construction which has developed parallel with the others? This whole sentence seems real old English. There is no definite article before the noun *dæd*, altho it is modified by a relative clause. This demonstrative construction may have originated in just such a sentence as this. The following simpler sentence may illustrate its origin more plainly: "Give me book there *you hold in your hand*." The demonstrative *there* points to the following asyndetic relative clause. In course of time these two constructions with *þe* came to be felt as relative clauses introduced by the relative *þe*, but the entire absence of inflection here makes it impossible for us to follow the historical development. The corresponding uninflected Old Norse form *es* is beset with the same difficulty. This *es* is usually treated as an uninflected relative, but it is probably an adverb with the force of *there* wherever

the demonstrative stands at the end of the principal proposition followed by the enclitic form of the adverb: "Matar ok váða es manni (dat. sing.) þorð / þeims (dat. sing. þeim es) hefr of fjall farit" ("Hóvamól" 3.2-3) "Food and clothing are a necessity for that man who has a trip over the mountain." The form *þeim* is in the dative and evidently is a demonstrative modifying *manni*. It stands in the usual place at the end of the principal proposition and along with the accompanying demonstrative adverb *s* points forward to the following asyndetic relative clause. The adverb *es* is often like Old English *þe* separated from the inflected demonstrative or the antecedent noun and stands at the beginning of the relative clause. In this case it may have already in Old Norse been felt as a relative, but its lack of inflection prevents us from following its historical development into a relative particle. In one passage although the inflected demonstrative and *es* stand together in the usual place at the end of the principal proposition the poetical measure seems to separate them by a cesural pause: "Vask með Fjölvari fimm vetr alla/ í eyju þeiri es Algrön heitir" (Hárbarðsljóð" 16. 1-2) "I lived five entire winters with Fjölvar upon that island which is called Algrön." We have a case exactly like this in "Beowulf" 1624-5 where, however, the poetic measure brings the two forms close together: "sælaca gefeah / maegenbyrþenna, þara þe he him mid hæfde" "He rejoiced in his sea-spoils, his heavy burden, the one he had with him." Is the *es* in the Old Norse example a relative and the *þe* in "Beowulf" an adverb? If we look at *es* here in the light of later Norse development it may appear to us as a relative. This may, however, be an entirely false interpretation of the Old Norse passage. A pause in modern English does not convert a demonstrative into a relative: "Give me that one, the one you hold in your other hand." Here there is a pause after *that one*, so that the two demonstratives are separated just as in Old Norse, but the demonstratives remain demonstratives. They still point as in oldest Germanic to the following asyndetic relative clause. The use of *es* as a *relative*

in this Old Norse clause seems especially doubtful because the verb employed is *heita*. The old asyndetic construction is especially tenacious with this verb and is even found in modern German literature: "Höret! im Osten von Flandern ist eine Wüste, darinnen / liegt ein einzelner Busch, *heisst* Hüsterlo, merket den Namen (Goethe)."

We now turn to the study of the development of the Gothic relative forms. The development corresponds closely to that found in the kindred Germanic languages, especially Old Norse. Like this language it lacks the first asyndetic type, the form with the simple demonstrative without the accompanying adverb. In the language of Wulfila the second asyndetic type has become established to the exclusion of the first. The adverb employed is *ei* with the demonstrative force of *there*. As in Old Norse the demonstrative adverb has become so closely identified with the demonstrative pronoun as an accompanying enclitic that it is felt as a part of it and in the written language is written together with it: *saei*, *soei*, *þatei*. The union of the two parts, however, is much firmer than in Old Norse, for the adverb is never separated from the demonstrative. The use of this asyndetic type corresponds closely to that found in the other Germanic languages: "Hwa nu wileiþ ei taujau þammei qīþīþ þiudan Iudaie?" (Mark 15.12) "What do you desire that I do to that one *you call the King of the Jews?*" Here *þammei* is not a relative as Gothic grammarians would have us believe but a demonstrative in the dative case with its appended demonstrative adverb. The construction corresponds exactly to the modern English demonstrative construction here as will become evident by comparing the Gothic with the English translation. The form *þammei* stands at the end of its clause so as to point forward to the following asyndetic relative clause. We give several other examples to make the construction perfectly plain: "Afdailja taihundon dail allis þizei *gastalda*" (Luke 18.12) "I give a tenth part of all that I *possess.*" "*ei* galaubjaiþ þammei *insandida jains*" (John 6.29) "that you believe on the one *he has sent.*" "Bi waldufnja þammei

frauja fragaf mis du gatimreinai jah ni du gataurþai" (2 Cor. 13.10) "in accordance with that power *the Lord gave me to edification and not to destruction*," or literally "power," "that one there, *the Lord gave me*." This construction is very clear to one who speaks English, as it is exactly like the modern English asyndetic construction with the exception that the demonstrative adverb which once accompanied the English construction has entirely disappeared. German scholars who have no natural feeling for this old construction and who have their eyes riveted upon the Greek text regard all these demonstrative forms as relatives. To explain the fact that these forms all have the cases required by the verb of the principal proposition they explain that the forms have been "attracted" into this case. These passages do not conform to the Greek at all. Wulfila followed here his natural Germanic feeling for this old construction. His usage corresponded very closely to modern English. He usually employs a clear relative form which stands in the case required by the verb of the relative clause: "in andwairþja attins meinis saei in himinam ist" (Matt. 10.32) "in the presence of my Father who is in heaven." Here the old demonstrative has become a relative as clearly shown by the fact that the case form is no longer that of the antecedent in the principal proposition but that required by the verb in the relative clause. Wulfila as a modern Englishman usually employs the relative form, but he does not studiously avoid the old demonstrative construction. He even passes from one to the other in the same sentence: "*þaim ei iupa sind* (asyndetic clause) *frapþaiþ, ni þaim þoei ana airþai sind* (Col. 3.2) "May you understand the things that are above, not those that are upon the earth." Here *þaim ei* is a demonstrative pointing to the following asyndetic relative clause, while *þoei* is a relative with the case required by the verb of the relative clause. Scholars who look so fixedly at the Greek that their feeling for Gothic is blunted usually take a Gothic form like *þaim ei* for a relative because they find a relative in the Greek text, but in the present instance *þaim ei* does not correspond to a Greek

relative at all, as Wulfila has translated the passage freely. We find here what we often find elsewhere. Wulfila endeavors to render the thought and feeling of the Greek original, he does not try to preserve the form. In the word-order he usually follows the Greek as closely as possible, because the *form* contained the *thought* and *feeling*, but here in the translation of relative constructions the form has nothing to do with thought and feeling and he employs the form that seems the most natural to him, be it demonstrative or relative. He often proceeds as in this last example, he uses a demonstrative and a relative construction where the Greek has an entirely different construction.

It is often very difficult to determine whether the form used is a demonstrative or a relative. In the large number of cases where there is no antecedent the construction is probably the asyndetic: "Saei *sandida mik* miþ mis ist" (John 8.29) "He *who sent me* is with me," literally "that one there, *he sent me*, is with me." Luther translates: "Der *mich gesandt hat*, ist mit mir." Also here *der* is a demonstrative which points to the following asyndetic relative clause. In both Gothic and German the demonstrative has the case required by the verb of the principal proposition. The asyndetic relative clause has no expressed subject. This is the regular usage throughout the different Germanic languages in this form of statement. Both subject and object may be understood in the asyndetic relative clause: þatei *qipþ gagaggip*" (Mark 11.23) "The things *he says* will come to pass." Here *þatei* is subject of the verb in the principal proposition just as is *the things* in the English translation. With English feeling we can understand this old construction perfectly, as we still use it and indeed are very fond of it. Similarly in a large number of sentences where there is an antecedent expressed the form may still be felt as a demonstrative: "sa ist Helias, saei skulda qiman" (Matt. 11.14) "He is Elias *who was to come*." Here *saei* may be the old demonstrative. It stands in the old familiar place at the end of the principal proposition pointing to the following asyndetic rela-

tive clause. Here *saei* repeats the *sa* of the principal proposition, the old familiar repetition so often found in all the Germanic languages. Out of the repetition of the demonstrative has developed the modern use of correlatives, the first form of which is a demonstrative, the second a relative. The relative form here can only be explained on the basis of an earlier demonstrative form. In such sentences we have not the slightest proof that at the time of Wulfila the second form was felt as a relative. The form in question *saei* is in the case required by the verb of the relative clause, but at the same time it is also in the case required by the verb of the principal proposition. There are signs elsewhere in the Gothic Bible that seem to indicate that Wulfila still felt his Gothic forms as demonstratives even though they are translations of Greek relatives, for instead of the demonstrative *in-ei* he may use the one *in-uh*, which is a demonstrative of a pronounced type: "Apþan kannja izwis, broþrjus, þatei aiwaggeli þatei merida izwis, þatuh jah andnemuþ, in þammei jah standiþ, þairh þatei jah ganisiþ" (1 Cor. 15.1) "But, brethren, I declare unto you that very gospel which I preached unto you, which also you have received, wherein you yourself also stand, by which also you are saved." Here the noun *aiwaggeli* is modified by four relative clauses. In the English translation these relative clauses are all introduced by a relative pronoun, but in the Gothic the second clause is introduced by the demonstrative *þatuh*. This strengthened demonstrative points to the following asyndetic relative clause. Here we have plain and convincing evidence that in the Gothic period the word introducing a relative clause was not necessarily a relative. It could be a demonstrative as here in case of *þatuh*. Originally every word that introduced a relative clause was a demonstrative. In the Gothic period the feeling for the presence of the demonstrative must have been well preserved. In the Gothic sentence before us not only the second clause is introduced by a demonstrative, but perhaps also the first clause. The writer feels it as a demonstrative. There is no absolute formal proof, but the parallelism in the structure of the four

clauses seems to indicate it. The first two clauses are introduced by demonstratives, the last two by relatives. The prepositions in the last two clauses show clearly that the forms are relatives. In the asyndetic construction the preposition cannot precede the demonstrative, as the demonstrative has the construction of its antecedent wherever, as here, it refers to a preceding noun. Another example has been given above of Wulfila's use of both the demonstrative and relative construction in the same sentence. This same demonstrative *sah* is also used in the following passage, although the corresponding form in the Greek is a relative: "Ip unleds sums was namin haitans Lazarus, *sah* (ὁς) atwauprans was du daura is banjo fulls" "Es war aber ein Armer mit Namen Lazarus, der lag vor seiner tür voller Schwären" (Luther) "There was a certain beggar named Lazarus which was laid at his gate full of sores" (King James version) (Luke 16.20). In the Greek the form ὁς clearly shows that the construction is a relative clause. Luther has employed a paratactical construction introduced by the demonstrative *der*. The word-order indicates that the clause is not felt as a hypotactical relative clause. The *which* in the English translation indicates that the English construction is a relative clause, but *which* is often, as here, used to join to the principal proposition an explanatory statement which is in reality not a hypotactical relative clause closely related to the principal proposition but rather a loosely related, almost independent utterance. Wulfila's construction resembles Luther's form of expression and is probably like it a paratactical construction. The use of the demonstrative clearly shows that the form is not felt as a relative. In both of these Gothic sentences Wulfila translates a Greek relative by a demonstrative. Here in the forms *patuh* and *sah* we have the absolute proof that both the hypotactical and loose relative clauses of the Greek are rendered in Gothic by clauses that are introduced by demonstratives. Thus it becomes perfectly clear that demonstrative forms in both *-ei* and *-uh* are used by Wulfila where the corresponding form in the Greek is a relative. Gothic and Greek are at this point in different

stages of development and hence we cannot expect to find here a close correspondence. We cannot in Gothic with absolute certainty distinguish a relative from a demonstrative except where the case form clearly indicates that the word is a relative.

In a number of examples in the preceding paragraph it is perfectly clear that forms in *-ei* are not relatives but demonstratives. If this is true we ought to be able to find these demonstrative forms in *-ei* outside of relative constructions. We now turn our attention to a number of other constructions where the forms in *-ei* appear as demonstratives.

One of the commonest constructions in the Gothic Bible is the use of the demonstrative in *-ei* as a conjunction corresponding to English *that*. In Gothic this form has not yet entirely lost its pure pronominal character, for it is sometimes inflected as the common demonstrative *pata* with the enclitic demonstrative adverb *-ei* joined with it: "Jah insaihwanedeins gaumidedun þammei afwalwiþs ist sa stains" (Mark 16.4) "And looking they saw this: *the stone is rolled away*." The verb *gaumidedun* governs the dative object. It is thus originally not a conjunction but a demonstrative that points forward to the following clause. It usually has the neuter accusative or nominative form *patei*, as these cases are the ones usually required in this construction: "Jah qaþ þatei Johannis sa daupjands us daupaim urrais (Mark 6.14) "And he said this: John the Baptist has arisen from the dead." Professor Streitberg on page 233 of his "Gotisches Elementarbuch" regards the demonstrative forms as relatives and again treats the dative form *þammei* given above as a case of a relative that has been "attracted" into the case of the demonstrative. Facts enough have been given above to show clearly that such forms are demonstratives, not relatives. The other Germanic languages have here the simple demonstrative form without the enclitic adverb as English *that*, German *dass* (formerly *das*). In older English, however, the form with the enclitic adverb *þe* is sometimes used, as *þaetþe* or *paette*.

The conjunction *that* is today much used in indirect discourse and this use is also well known in the older periods, but in the oldest period there is a much more frequent use of direct discourse than we find today. The more convenient indirect form is a development out of the older direct statement: Gothic as an old language shows this older usage very plainly: "þaruh reiks ains qimands inwait ina qipands þatei dauhtar meina nu gaswalt" (Matt. 9.18) "Then there came a certain ruler and worshiped him saying this: *my daughter has just died.*" Professor Streitberg on page 233 of his Gothic grammar has thrown the suspicion of Greek influence upon this old Germanic construction. He thinks the use of *þatei* here ungermanic because he has the false conception that it is a relative and thinks it is used here in imitation of the Greek relative conjunction *ὅτι* which likewise stands before a direct statement. Of course Gothic *þatei* here is not a relative but a demonstrative pointing to the following direct statement. This usage is also found in the other Germanic languages: "Wiht," quad, "sagen ih iu thaz, ni nemet scazzes umbi thaz, iu lazzet unthrata thero woroltliuto miata" (Otfrid III 14. 99-100) "He said, I tell you this: don't take any money with you for this, let the reward of the world be worthless to you." The two imperative clauses are in apposition with *thaz*. The *thaz* points forward to the two following clauses. The two imperative clauses are a direct statement instead of an indirect one just as in case of the Gothic example given above. Instead of *thaz* also other words with demonstrative force may be used: "Wib, ih zellu thir ein, was drift sulih zi uns zwein?" (ib. II. 8.17) "Woman, I say one thing to you: what matters this to us two?" Here Otfrid uses *ein* to point forward to the following question. It is evidently not ungermanic to use demonstratives here. It would be nearer to the truth to say that in the course of time the Greek *ὅτι* from quite another starting point had gradually approached the force of Gothic *þatei* than to say that Wulfila slavishly imitated the Greek. It is real interesting to compare Wulfila's translation here with that of the O. H. G. translator of the Latin Tatian.

The German translator renders the Latin *quia* by *wanta* (which means *because*) even where the *quia* like Greek $\delta\tau\iota$ stands before a direct statement: "Inti giwiznessi sageta Iohannes sus quedanti: wanta ih gisah geist nidarstigant samaso tubun fon himile" (14.6) "And John gave testimony saying: *I saw a spirit descend from heaven like a dove.*" The German translator does not at times seem to have the faintest idea of the development of *quod* and *quia* in such a sentence. The idea of cause has to him attached to the Latin form and he thoughtlessly translates by the corresponding German word denoting a cause. Alongside of the causal meaning in *quod* and *quia* there had developed another which was almost identical with that of German *daz*, Gothic *patei* and which still survives in all the Romance languages in the form of *que*, *che*, etc. This force was also often felt by the German translator in his best moments and he translated the Latin form correctly by *daz* just as Wulfila rendered the corresponding Greek $\delta\tau\iota$ by *patei*: "Wuo quidet theser thaz: ih von himile nidarsteig?" (82.8) "How comes it that this man says this: *I came down from heaven?*" It still remains difficult to conceive how this light could at times leave him and how he could return to the senseless *wanta*. The difficulty is increased by the fact that the German Isidor has also made this blunder. This translator has a good reputation as a careful idiomatic renderer, but this one blunder is so stupid that it casts a serious reflection upon his work. The writer can only conceive of the possibility of such a blunder by imagining that in student practise the use of *wanta* here had gradually become established from the thoughtless rendering of Latin into German.

The demonstrative form in *-ei* discussed in the preceding paragraphs are all used substantively, but it would be strange indeed if these forms were not also used attributively standing as a modifying adjective *before* a noun. In fact such forms are found in the Gothic Bible. In the following sentence the attributive demonstrative in *-ei*, the *patei* standing before *aiwaggeli*, points to a following relative clause: "Aþþan kannja izwis,

broþrjus, *þatei aiwaggeli þatei* (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ) merida izwis, þatuh jah andnemuh, in þammei jah standiþ, þairh þatei jah ganisiþ" (1 Cor. 15.1) "But, brethren, I declare unto you that very gospel which I preached unto you, which also you have received, wherein you yourselves also stand, by which also you are saved." It is apparent from the translation that the writer regards the first *þatei* as a strong attributive demonstrative. Usually there is no article or other demonstrative before a noun when it is modified by a following relative clause. There is in the Greek here an article before the noun, but in the Gothic the use of the article here is not usually regulated by the Greek. Wulfila, however, occasionally employs the demonstrative before the noun just as the Greek here to make it more prominent or individualize it: "gamuneih þis waurdis þatei ik qaþ du izwis: nist skalks maiza frauin seinamma" (John 15.20) "Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord." Here the simple demonstrative *þis* is used for emphasis. It would be more common to use the simple form *þata* also in the preceding Gothic sentence, but the longer form in *-ei* is more emphatic and is quite appropriate here where a heavy series of four relative clauses follow. In German we could either say here *das Evangelium das*, etc., or *dasjenige Evangelium das*, etc. Professor Streitberg says concerning Wulfila's form *þatei* here on page 271 of his "Gotische Bibel": "zum Einschub von *þatei* vgl. Ambrst: *notum enim facio vobis, fratres, quia evangelium, quod praedicavi vobis* usw." The professor with considerable confidence regards *þatei* as a late insertion, as a translation for the late Latin form *quia* to which the attention was directed above in connection with the efforts of the German translators of Tatian and Isidor to render late Latin into their mother tongue. The theory is plausible enough, but there is no convincing force in it. It is easy to concoct conjectures. We might explain a large part of the Bible entirely away. The text as handed down to us is real good Gothic and we have no reason to change the language. There are also other examples of the

use of the strengthened form in *-ei* in attributive use pointing forward to a following clause: "*In þizozei waihtais* (ρούρον χάρις) bilaiþ þus in Kretai, *in þizei* (wanting in the Greek original) *ei* wanata atgaraihtjais jah gasatjais and baurgs praizbytairein, swaswe ik þus garaidida" (Tit. 1.5) "For this very thing I left you in Crete *for this very thing* that you should set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in the cities as I had commanded you." For the sake of making the text here perfectly plain for the purpose of studying it we have taken the liberty of changing the exceptional form *þize* found in the manuscript to the common form *þizei* usually found elsewhere. Here we have two demonstrative forms in *-ei* pointing forward to the following clause. The Greek text *ρούρον* and the thought both clearly indicate demonstrative not relative function. This passage is a sore trial to those who see only relative force in forms in *ei*. Professor Streitberg remarks on p. 223 of his Grammar: "Aber die Möglichkeit eines Überlieferungsfehlers ist nicht ganz abzuweisen." He then argues that the first form in *-ei* was not clear to the copyist so that he tried to explain it by adding the note *in þizei* which later crept into the text as an integral part of it. It seems scarcely conceivable that any one should ever feel called to explain such a simple phrase as "*in þizozei waihtais*" *for this very thing*. What could there possibly be in this phrase that one could not understand? If it were the form in *-ei* that he did not understand he would not surely explain it by another form in *-ei*. The writer assumes that the manuscript form *þize* must stand for *þizei* the singular, not for the plural *þize*, for the preceding singular noun *waihtais* precludes the possibility of a plural conception here. The best thing to do here is to leave the Gothic text as it has been handed down to us. Whether it was Wulfila who inserted *in þize* or some one else the Gothic sentence is a fine one. It sounds like Wulfila. The repetition of *þizei* is forceful and makes the impression of spoken language upon us. Scholars have been reading this passage with their eyes without trying to feel it. It

might be interesting to foreigners to learn that in the language of uneducated Americans there is a very common construction corresponding exactly to this attributive Gothic demonstrative in *-ei*: "*that there man* you see yonder." In our popular English the adverb has become a part of the demonstrative just as *-ei* has become a part of the attributive demonstrative *þizozei* in this last Gothic passage. In literary English it is necessary to say *that man there*, as the adverb has not become a part of the demonstrative.

In all the preceding cases of demonstrative forms in *-ei* the reference was uniformly to a following clause. The reference, however, may also be backward: *Ni manna izwis usluto lausain waurdam, þairh þoei (διὰ ταῦτα) qimiþ hatigudis ana sunum ungalaubeinai*s" (Eph. 5.6) "Let no man deceive you with vain words; because of these things the wrath of God comes upon the children of unbelief." Here *þoei* is a clear case of the demonstrative in *-ei*. It points back to the words *lausaim waurdam*. A demonstration is demanded by the thought and the Greek demonstrative in the original *ταῦτα* naturally suggested its use to Wulfila. There is a similar use of the demonstrative in Matt. 27.46: *helei, helei, lima sibakþani, þatei ist (τοῦτ, ἔστιν): guþ meins, guþ meins duhwe mis bilaist?*" "Eli, eli, lama sabachthani? that is, my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Again in 2 Cor. 12.8: "*þi þatei (ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτου) þrim sinþam frauþan baþ*" "for this thing I besought the Lord thrice." These passages all naturally demand the use of the demonstrative here and Wulfila followed the natural meaning and the Greek text. Scholars who cannot understand that forms in *-ei* were once all demonstratives and still in the Gothic Bible often preserve their old meaning explain all these forms erroneously as relatives. In 1 Cor. 10.17 there is another case of the use of the demonstrative in *-ei* that has greatly puzzled the grammarians: "*Unte ains hlaifs, ain leik þai managans sium, þaiei arik allai ainis hlaibis jah ainis stiklis brukjam*" (οὐ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἁπλοῦς μετέχομεν) "For we, though the throng is great, are one bread and one body; for

we, all these, partake of one bread and one cup." Here the Gothic translator very nicely and faithfully renders Greek $\delta\epsilon$ by the demonstrative *þaiei*, but some grammarians thinking that every form in-*ei* must be a relative pronoun assume that Wulfila must have taken Greek $\delta\epsilon$ for $\delta\iota$. Others explain this form by the convenient interpolation theory. Professor Streitberg remarks on page 263 of his "Gotische Bibel" among other things: "Vielmehr ist das grammatische unkorrekte *þaiei* nachträglich eingesetzt unter dem Einfluss von vg: omnes qui de uno pane participamus." He then shows that $\delta\iota$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ with a verb in the first person plural is translated in 2 Cor. 5.10 by *allai weiþ* and concludes: "Ursprünglich hiess es daher wohl: *weiþ auk*" "Love of conjecture has blinded Professor Streitberg to the simple facts." The two cases he compares are quite different. In 2 Cor. 5.10 there are a series of verbs in the first person plural and the whole construction is turned in the direction of the first person, while here in the above example the first part of the sentence has the third person form *þai managans*, to which in the second half the third person demonstrative form *þaiei* closely conforms. When Wulfila's *þaiei* is correctly interpreted as a demonstrative the construction becomes quite simple and plain. There is one instance of the use of the demonstrative in-*ei* that has a peculiar interest by reason of its forcefulness: "duppe ei siggwandans mageiþ frapjan frodein meinai in runai Xristaus, þatei anþaraim aldim ni kunþ was sunnum manne" (Eph. 3.4-5) "For this reason that you might read and understand my knowledge in the *mystery of Christ*, that was in other ages not made known to the sons of men." The English rendering does not bring out the full force of the Gothic. The neuter form *þatei* refers to the two words *runai Xristaus* just as we say in German: Die Liebe der Mutter, das ist ach etwas Schönes! Here *das* refers to *die Liebe der Mutter*. In Gothic this is still clearer, as it is the prevailing use of demonstrative forms in-*ei* to point not to individual objects, but to a thought, a sentence, or a clause. In Greek the relative δ is used pointing back to the one word $\mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$. Wulfila has more appropriately referred to

the two words. The absolute proof that this is not a relative construction as in Greek, but a demonstrative construction, lies in the fact of the non-agreement of the form *þatei* with any definite antecedent. The use of the neuter *demonstrative* with reference to a previous thought is common in all the Germanic languages. It may even refer to a feminine noun: "Das ist eine Uhr." As far as the writer's knowledge goes this is not true of a relative pronoun outside of modern German. This convenient use of the neuter demonstrative spread in modern German to explanatory relative clauses which have almost the force of independent statements: "Unter andern hat er eine Sündflut gemalt, *das* etwas Einziges ist." (Goethe.) After the analogy of *das* also *welches* came to be used thus: "Dies Buch nannte man den Shakspeare, *welches* der Verfasser desselben war." (G. Keller.) This curious relative construction was quite common in the eighteenth century, but it has now almost disappeared.

In the preceding paragraphs the demonstrative forms *in-ei* either point forward to a following clause or point backward to a sentence, thought, or less commonly to individuals. It is also used as a real demonstrative where a significant gesture points out the object: "Iþ jabai hwas qiþai *þatei galiugam gasaliþ ist* (τοῦτο εἰδωλόθυτον ἐστίν), ni matjaip" 1 Cor. 10.28) "But if any man say unto you: *that there* is offered in sacrifice unto idols eat not of it." The form *þatei* here translates the Greek demonstrative *τοῦτο*. It has here its old literal meaning *that there* and corresponds exactly to English *that there* or to German *das da*. It is, however, a puzzle to scholars who see a relative in every form *in-ei*. They try to explain the form in some other way.

We now turn away from the demonstrative to the consideration of a number of constructions that suffer under the suspicion of foreign influence.

The suspicion of Latin influence has been thrown upon the most pronounced idiomatic Gothic construction in the language. In all the Germanic tongues the different modifiers of a noun

may precede it with the exception of a relative clause. In Gothic also the relative clause may precede its governing noun: "Gif mis, *sei undrinnai mik dail aiginis*" (Luke, 15.12) "Give me the portion of the goods that falls to me." Professor Streitberg on page 143 of his "Gotische Bibel" remarks on this passage: "in der Wortstellung *d* ähnlich: *quod me tanget partem substantiæ*." A glance at the two constructions, Gothic and Latin, will make it plain that the two constructions are entirely different. In Latin the *quod* clause is a substantive clause, in Gothic the corresponding clause is a relative clause. Fortunately there are a number of examples in Gothic so that this question can be studied thoroly. The relative clause can even follow an article just as an adjective: "*pata nu gasaih-wands Iohannes, þo sei ustauhana habaida wairþan fram frauþin garehsn*" ("Skeireins," 1.5) "John now seeing this, the plan *that was to be carried out by the Lord*." In Gothic a relative clause may precede the noun and another may follow it, as in 2 Tim. 1.5. Also in the Greek Testament a relative clause may precede the governing noun, but in Gothic this construction occurs quite independently of the Greek. That Professor Streitberg has not thoroly understood this construction has led him to interpolate a word into his Gothic text. The original text runs as follows: "Unte ni þatei wiljau waurkja goþ, ak þatei ni wiljau ubil tauja (Rom. 7.19) οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' ὁ οὐ θέλω κακὸν τοῦτο πράσσω" "For I do not do the good which I would do, but do the evil which I would not do." Professor Streitberg has inserted *þatei* after *ubil* simply because there is a *τοῦτο* in the Greek here. He has misunderstood the Gothic here entirely. The relative clause precedes here the governing word *ubil*. In accordance with Gothic usage elsewhere a demonstrative is not required before or after the governing noun if it is modified by a relative clause. This can be seen also in the first half of the sentence. It might be argued here that these clauses are indefinite substantive clauses in the Greek. This is doubtful; it may, however, possibly be true. But be that as it may, Wulfila has construed them as adjective clauses, as have also

Luther and the authors of the King James version of the English Bible; only, however, in the English and German versions the relative clauses follow the governing noun. Wulfila allows the relative clause to precede not only where the relative is neuter, as here, but also where it is masculine or feminine; also where the Greek has another construction: "ju ni ik waurkja ita, ak sei bauiþ in mis frawaurhts" (Rom. 7.20) (ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία) "I do not do it, but sin that dwells within me." As Professor Streitberg does not understand this Gothic construction he has thrown false light upon another passage in Wulfila's translation: "du þammei arbaidja usdaudjands bi waurstwa sei inna uswaurkeiþ in mis in mahtai" (Col. 1.29) (κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει) "Whereunto I labor, striving with energy by the aid of that power which works within me." The relative clause here precedes the governing noun *mahtai*. Notice in the English translation the word *that* before *power*. This word is not required in the Gothic and is here lacking just as it is in the passage from Rom. 7.19, given above. Notice that the preposition *in* stands between the governing noun and its modifying relative clause. This usage is not peculiar to this sentence, but also elsewhere some word that governs the governing noun may separate it from its modifying clause. Thus this passage which has so much puzzled scholars becomes perfectly clear. It seems to the writer that this passage is quite simple and plain. It has worried scholars because they had their eyes fixed upon the Greek more than upon the Gothic. Professor Streitberg, on page 385 of his "Gotische Bibel," remarks: "αὐτοῦ fehlt." This learned man is puzzled by the thought that Wulfila would overlook an important Greek word in his translation. He has not noticed that the Gothic translator has entirely reconstructed the sentence. As far as the author knows no one has ever attempted to study the Gothic sentence in its own light. When Castiglione reported the reading *bi waurstwa sei inna uswaurkeiþ*, scholars with the Greek in mind at once construed *waurstwa* as the antecedent of *sei*, but as *waurstwa* is neuter, they amended the text and changed *sei* into *þatei*. Re-

cently, after Director Braun's report of his investigation of the manuscript to the effect that the form *sei* is quite surely the actual reading of the manuscript, Professor Streitberg, in his Gothic Bible, page 384, comes to the conclusion that this *sei* may be a survival of a still older period, when *sei* was not feminine at all, but an adverb with the force of *so*, which was once also in German used as a relative. Thus as an indeclinable relative *sei* could, after all, refer to the neuter *waurstwa*. Thus scholars are often prone to resort to the wildest conjectures rather than do such a simple thing as to look at the Gothic itself and study it. The *sei* does not go back to *waurstwa*, but points to its antecedent *mahtai*, which stands at the end. The passage must be read not by the Greek, but in its own light. Doubting Thomases who may hesitate to accept these simple facts because they inwardly believe we ought to construe all of Wulfila's Gothic in strict accordance with the Greek ought to become at least a little wavering in their views when they see that Wulfila has elsewhere deviated from the Greek just to be able to employ this favorite construction, the placing of the relative clause before the governing noun. There is in this construction nothing ungrammatical or illogical; indeed, it has its decided advantages. It is rather to be wondered at that it did not spring up in other Germanic languages.

On page 205 of his "Gotisches Elementarbuch" Professor Streitberg remarks: "Sicher Gräzismen sind die gotischen Akkusative m. Infinitiv nach *swaswe* und *swaei* und nach unpersönlichen Ausdrücken wie *gop ist*, *azetizo ist*, *gadob ist*." Again, on page 240, he says: "Wenn *swaswe* und *swaei* vereinzelt mit dem Infinitiv verbunden werden, so ist hierin eine mechanische Nachahmung der Konstruktion von *ἵνα* zu sehen." This learned scholar has studied this question solely from the narrow viewpoint of his own native language and consequently has not noticed that it is a natural Gothic development. The construction is not probably primitive Germanic, but the beginnings of the construction were already there, and in several Germanic languages further developments are to be found. Let us look

at this development in Gothic, the oldest Germanic language. Originally the accusative in the construction of the accusative with the infinitive was an object of the principal verb: "þan gasaihwip þata wairþan" (Mark. 13.29) "When you shall see these things come to pass." Here there are two objects, the pronoun *þata* and the infinitive *wairþan*. In course of time the first object came to be felt as the subject of the infinitive: "man auk ni waihtai mik minnizo gataujan" (2 Cor. 11.5) "I do not think that I in any respect accomplish less." Here the subject of the infinitive cannot, as in the preceding example, be also construed as the object of the principal verb. The construction is a distinct new development, *the accusative with the infinitive can replace a clause with a finite verb*. This construction must already in Gothic have acquired some strength of life, for as in this last sentence it is sometimes used independently of the Greek original. This use of the infinitive instead of a finite verb in a subordinate clause is also found in Gothic in another form. The subject of the infinitive may not be expressed at all when it would be the same as the subject of the principal proposition: "þata þus melja, wenjands qiman at þus sprauto" (1 Tim. 3.14) "These things I write to you hoping to come (or that I may come) to you soon." This form of expression has become a favorite construction in all the Germanic languages, altho the boundaries of usage here vary widely in the different languages. It is especially established in object clauses and in clauses of purpose and result. In case that the subject of the infinitive is different from that of the principal proposition, the subject of the infinitive must be expressed: "Apþan wenja jah in miþwisseim izwaraim swikunþans wisan uns" (2 Cor. 5.11) "I hope we are also made manifest in your consciences." In the Greek the subject of the infinitive is not expressed, as the writer trusted to the context to make the reference clear, but Wulfila felt vividly the force of the Germanic law that construes an unexpressed subject of the infinitive as the same as that of the principal proposition. If he had omitted the subject of the infinitive, the subject of the principal proposition

would have been felt as the subject of the infinitive and the thought would have been changed. He had the choice of two constructions here—the accusative with the infinitive, or a subordinate clause with a finite verb. In English we also often have the same choice of constructions: “Report declared *him to be dead*,” or, “*that he was dead*.” In Gothic the construction with the accusative and infinitive had in general a limited field of usefulness. The clause form with a finite verb was more common. In English this infinitive construction has flourished and greatly extended its boundaries. The infinitive can often be used where it can no longer be construed as the object of the principal verb: “I want him to stay away.” Here the meaning is not “I want *to stay away*,” but I want “*him to stay away*.” The accusative with the infinitive has become a fixed type of subordinate clause with its own peculiar form—with an infinitive as verb and an accusative as subject. The accusative with the infinitive can also stand after a preposition as well as after a verb: “I am planning for *my son to study medicine*.” “I am waiting for *him to come*.” The preposition *for* here has become so intimately associated with the construction as a whole that it can no longer be construed as a real preposition governing the following accusative, for we can now say: “I am praying for *him to stay away*.” The meaning cannot be “I am praying for him,” but “I am praying for *him to stay away*.” There is a still further development where *for* is not felt as belonging to the principal verb, but as a part of the infinitive clause: “I am hoping for *him to come*.” This form is also used in subject clauses: “*For* a man of such standing in the community *to do* such a thing is greatly to be deplored.” Probably this form where found in subject clauses had a somewhat different origin, but it was undoubtedly influenced by the common usage in object clauses after verbs. In modern German there is nothing whatever to correspond to this widely used English construction. German scholars studying Gothic see in Wulfila’s natural impulse, to use the terse and convenient infinitive construction, nothing but a slavish imitation of the Greek.

What we see in Wulfila's language as a natural tendency in its incipient stages has become in English a common construction with wide boundaries. English usage here is often quite similar to the Greek, but it is not born of the Greek. In all these languages this construction is simply the development of a natural tendency. It is only a matter of course that the development in the different languages is not at every point exactly the same. At some points they coincide, at others they diverge. Even in the same category usage is not always uniform in the different languages.

Professor Streitberg does not think this infinitive construction entirely ungothic after some verbs, as the same construction occurs also in Old Norse. After *swaswe* and *swaei*, however, and the impersonal constructions *gop ist*, *azetizo ist*, *gadob ist*, he thinks the usage is due to Greek influence. He eliminates the construction in the following passage from Luke 4.36 by adopting an emendation which interpolates into the text the word inclosed in parentheses: "Jah warþ afslauþnan (ana) allans" "And they were all amazed." There is here not the slightest grounds to assume an ellipsis of *ana*. The construction as it has come down to us is good Wulfilian and probably good Gothic. It is ruled out by Professor Streitberg in his Gothic Bible, as it is not found in the Greek. As it does not fit into any of his theories it must be a mistake. As we see by the original text this infinitive construction has spread to subject clauses. It is also found in a subject clause in the "Skeireins" after one of the impersonal constructions: "Gadob nu was mais þans swesamma wiljin ufhausjandans diabulau, du ufar-gaggan anabusn gudis, þanzuh aftra swesamma wiljin gaquissans wairþan nasjandins laiseinai jah frakunnan unselein þis faurþis uslutondins, iþ sunjos kunþi du aftraanastodeinai þize in guda usmete *gasatjan*" ("Skeireins," 1.14-17) "It was more fitting for those who had of their own free wills yielded to the promptings of the devil to transgress God's law that they now of their own free wills should assent to the teaching of the Savior and despise the meanness of him who had formerly led them astray and

should attain to a recognition of the truth for the renewing of their relations with God." It is a pity we do not know who wrote the "Skeireins!" Did Wulfila or another? Is it a translation from the Greek, or is it an independent work? This infinitive construction occurs three times in this one passage. It also occurs several times in subject clauses in the Gothic Bible: "Wasuh þan Kajafa saei garaginoda Iudaium þatei batizo ist *ainana mannan fraqistjan faur managein*" (John, 18.14) "Now Caiaphas was he who gave counsel to the Jews that it was expedient that one man should be killed for the people." "Ip azetizo ist *himin jah airpa hindarleipþan þau witodis ainana writ gadriusan*" (Luke, 16.17) "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fail." Alongside of this construction with the accusative and the infinitive here we also find the *dative* and *infinitive*: "hwaiwa aglu ist *þaim hugjandam afar faihau in þiudangardja gudis galeipþan*" (Mark, 10.24) "How hard it is for those who strive for money to enter into the kingdom of God." Thus there are two entirely different constructions in subject clauses. The dative originated in this category, while the accusative is after the analogy of the accusative found in object clauses as the object of a verb or preposition, as illustrated above. It is only natural that a type which has become established in one category should spread to another. We see the same thing in English. The dative type was once common in English, but it has been replaced by the construction with *for* with the infinitive, as can be seen in the English translations of the last two Gothic sentences. It may be possible that the construction with *for* has sprung directly from the dative construction, but it is quite evident that this process has been facilitated by the example of the *for* construction so common after verbs and prepositions in object clauses as described above. The *for* construction is only felt as a single type, not as two different types. In subject clauses just as in object clauses the *for* is felt as a formal introduction to the infinitive clause: "*For him to do that* is quite fitting." The infinitive clause is here a noun-equivalent,

the subject of the sentence, and the *for* is a part of this subject and is no longer felt as a part of the predicate as it originally was. The subject of the infinitive clause is in English in the accusative just as it is in Gothic. German scholars cannot see how in a Germanic language the subject of a subject clause can be in the accusative and conclude that the Gothic expression is of Greek origin. In Gothic the construction with the accusative with the infinitive spread from object clauses to subject clauses, just exactly as the English construction with *for* with the infinitive spread from object clauses to subject clauses. That which seems perfectly natural here to one who speaks English seems something unnatural, something foreign, something Greek to a German scholar. As the Greek itself originated in exactly the same way the whole process seems quite natural. The German language in not developing this construction has been very unfortunate indeed and makes the impression of clumsiness upon one who speaks English. The German form with the finite verb is also used in English, but its constant use would be felt as burdensome. In one point Gothic usage differs from English. It extended the use of the accusative with the infinitive to clauses of result after *swaswe* and *swaei* or *swe*: “jah galesun sik du imma manageins filu, swaswe ina galeiþan in skip” (Mark, 4.1) “There were gathered unto him a great multitude, so that he entered into a ship.” The infinitive construction here, instead of a clause with a finite verb, is in very common use in English: “I timed my departure from the city so as to arrive home at noon.” The difference between English and Gothic here is, however, a marked one. We cannot use the infinitive here at all if the subject of the infinitive is not the same as that of the principal proposition. We must then employ a clause with a finite verb: “We sent our presents so that they would arrive on Christmas day.” We are, however, so fond of the infinitive here that in colloquial language we avoid the clause with the finite verb in every possible way and shift the words around so as to be able to use the infinitive by making its subject the same as that of the principal proposition: “We sent

our presents so as to have them arrive on Christmas day." Thus English usage is here firmly fixed in the direction of Wulfila's use of the infinitive in clauses of result, but it has developed a marked individual peculiarity of its own, it uniformly shifts the words around so as to make the subject of the infinitive the same as that of the principal verb and thus avoid the use of the accusative here. The construction with the *accusative* and the infinitive has not developed in this category in any Germanic language except Gothic. The Gothic corresponds closely to the Greek in the few cases where this construction is used. Usually Wulfila employs a clause with a finite verb here just as in choice literary style in English. The fact remains, however, that Wulfila also used the accusative with the infinitive here. It does not seem probable that he here merely imitated the Greek mechanically. It was not his way. Language talent asserts itself spontaneously, not by jerks. Wulfila regularly shows a fine feeling for his native speech, and we must remember that he is usually a free translator in rendering the Greek infinitive. In this case there was a natural tendency to follow in this category of clause of result the analogy of the usage in other categories and thus employ the accusative with the infinitive. It was a natural tendency, but it had not developed a strong life. It is interesting to note that in one instance Wulfila employs the simple infinitive construction just as in colloquial English: "jah gaggandans galipun in haim Samareite, swe (σωτε) manwjan imma" (Luke, 9.52) "And they went and entered into a village of the Samaritans (so as) to make ready for him." It sounds a little better to the writer in this particular instance to drop *so as* in the English translation, but in general *so as* is quite common in English and corresponds closely to Gothic *swe* as used in this sentence. Here *swe* just as σωτε in the Greek original introduces a clause of purpose. It usually introduces a clause of result. In all languages purpose and result are so vitally connected that the same grammatical form is very often used for both categories. The use of Gothic *swe* here is not common. Wulfila usually employs *du* with the infinitive to

express purpose. Did he mechanically imitate the Greek? The case looks very suspicious, but the writer believes that there was some natural tendency in Wulfila's own language that allowed him to follow the Greek. We know the Gothic language only in one period of its development and hence we cannot study it in its historical development. Perhaps this infinitive of purpose introduced by *swe* was the forerunner of a powerful construction, just as the first *um zu* found in German was the forerunner of a powerful construction that has in large measure replaced the older infinitive with *zu*. Powerful constructions do not spring up all at once. There was in the case of even the most widely used construction a time when it was only used once in a book or a conversation. Some scholars study Wulfila's Gothic like a butcher who chops up a piece of meat into little pieces for the retail trade. These scholars divide up Wulfila's speech mechanically into little categories and forget that it is an interesting piece of a living historical development which had a past and is destined to have a short future. Wulfila in using his *swe* in this one place in a clause of purpose, while he elsewhere employs it in clauses of result only, did what we do in English when we use *so as* in clauses of purpose. We do this very often in colloquial language, for *in order to* tho clearer is not a favorite. It has come to such a pass in the author's own English that he cannot always tell whether he himself means purpose or result when he uses *so as* in conversation. In cases of doubt he has submitted his sentences to friends and these friends differed among themselves as to the interpretation of the utterances. This aptly illustrates how closely these two categories are related and how natural it was for Wulfila to employ *swe* here in a clause of purpose, although he elsewhere uses it in clauses of result. In glancing back over Wulfila's use of the infinitive in all these categories we observe that he is very inconsistent in following the Greek. He now renders an infinitive by a finite verb, now by an infinitive; that is, in his Gothic he follows his natural feeling, now using the one construction, now the other. This inconsistency is the proof of his inner consist-

ency. A speaker who has a live feeling for the consistency, the harmony, the melody of language, must follow not a grammatical category, but the inner promptings of the soul. Strangely enough, Professor Streitberg says on page 206 of his Gothic Grammar that this frequent change of construction is a proof of the ungothic character of Wulfila's language. This is a fine example of what a man can say and think who is possessed by a fixed idea. In English we can say: "I timed my departure from the city *so as to arrive home at noon*, or, *so that I might arrive home at noon*." The latter construction is not so common as the former, but it is good English. What would one think of a scholar who claimed that we would not speak good English if we did not consistently use one of these constructions thruout a book to the absolute exclusion of the other? Mr. Stolzenburg in the article referred to above is a little more charitable toward Wulfila in judging of his frequent very close approaches to the Greek text in these infinitive constructions, and elsewhere where he seems to follow the Greek form of expression. Mr. Stolzenburg advances the theory that Wulfila has had predecessors. A series of learned writers had developed a learned Gothic under Greek influence, so that a number of these Greek constructions had become established in the language and were perfectly familiar to Wulfila and had become a part of his own speech. We have no means of ascertaining whether there is any basis of fact for this theory. It may also be true that Wulfila has been influenced more or less *directly* by the Greek. Even if both of these theories are true it does not follow that the Gothic as we have it is a direct imitation of the Greek. All the points of similarity between Wulfila's language and that of the Greek Bible can be scientifically explained as natural Gothic constructions. Other Germanic languages show similar developments. If these natural constructions correspond to the Greek there was often a natural impulse in the Gothic translator to follow the Greek. Greek influence chiefly lay in this direction of *furthering* similar developments in the Gothic. In no case of genuine Wulfilian Gothic do we find slavish imitation of the Greek or Latin.

Those who are always hunting in the language of Wulfila for cases of slavish imitation of the Greek are often so possessed by this fixed idea that they do not take the least pains to investigate, do not sometimes even penetrate below the surface. The following remark from page 156 of Professor Streitberg's "Gotisches Elementarbuch" is a classical example of this superficial scholarship: "In sklavischer Nachahmung des Griechischen steht bisweilen der Nominativ in der Anrede auch dort, wo eine Vokativform existiert, vgl. *hails*, *þiudans*, Iudaie χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, John 19.3, gegenüber *hails þiudan Iudaie* χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Mark 15.18." Professor Streitberg has simply cast a glance at the forms without giving the meaning the least thought. He has not noticed that Wulfila's usage here corresponds to his usage elsewhere and is based upon a careful weighing of the thought and feeling. The two passages are parallel accounts of the same events, the one from John, the other from Mark. They represent two different forms of direct address in both Greek and Gothic and still thrive in the different Germanic languages. In the passage from Mark the noun is in the vocative and the utterance is merely a formal greeting: "Hail, King of the Jews!" The soldiers had platted a crown of thorns and placed it upon the head of Jesus. The salute of the soldiers is, of course, here sarcastic. In the passage from John the use of the nominative instead of the vocative is to impart to the word the idea of a definite personal *declaration* or *predication*: "Gesegnet sei *der König der Juden*." The predication in nominative form in this individual instance gives a strong sarcastic tone to the utterance. Wulfila has here with true feeling for the meaning of the Greek nominative made a fine translation. This use of the nominative in direct address and exclamation instead of a vocative is not infrequent in Latin and Greek and is nicely illustrated by the following passage from Plautus, where, however, the predication is made in a warm, friendly tone: "tu interim, *meus oculus*, da mihi savium!" In Rom. 7.24 we find the same principle involved: "wainahs ik manna!" ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος "O wretched man that I

am!" Wulfila has here employed the strong nominative form of the adjective to give the utterance the force of a declaration or predication as well as that of an exclamation. Wulfila had an advantage here in having at his disposal a choice between two adjective declensions, and he has made fine use of his advantage. In employing the strong form of the adjective he has added force to the declension. The weak form is more commonly used in direct address, as the usual object here is merely to make clear and definite the individual to whom reference is made. The strong form of the adjective is, however, sometimes used here to call attention to the quality in the individual rather than merely to point out an individual, and hence the strong form adds the idea of a predication to the statement. Thus the strong form strengthens the idea of predication that already lies in the *nominative* case. It is a most interesting fact that the few strong adjectives that are used in the Gothic Bible in exclamations are all in the nominative, not one case of the vocative of a strong adjective in the language. Thus in Gothic adjectives the vocative went out of existence, for the weak adjective had no distinct vocative forms and the strong adjective lost the vocative as the nominative was felt as a clearer expression for the idea of predication. Wulfila follows the Greek in using the nominative in direct address and exclamations, but he shows that he is not slavishly imitating the original but feels the full force of the original by his choice of the strong form of the adjective. He shows his independence here also in other ways. In Mark 9.25 he uses here the nominative as in Greek, but he replaces the Greek article by a personal pronoun: "þu ahma, þu unrodjands jah bauþs, ik þus anabiuda τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν ἐγώ σοι ἐπιτάσσω "Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee." The translator is here very clever in the rendering of the Greek. He preserves the predicating declarative force of the Greek by the use of the strong form in adjective and participle, and he at the same time gives the statement the form of direct address by the use of the personal pronoun of the second person. This fine expression shows not only that the Gothic was at this point

superior to the Greek, but it also shows us a Gothic man of fine feeling who knew how to bring out of his native language its possibilities. The more we penetrate into the study of the little details of Wulfila's speech the clearer we see its true Gothic quality.

On page 155 of Professor Streitberg's Gothic Grammar we have in Note 2 another classic example of superficial observation. The suspicion of Greek influence is cast upon one of the oldest and most persistent Germanic constructions, namely, that of the predicate nominative after verbs of "calling." The Gothic by reason of its preservation of the vocative case throws some interesting light upon the original forms of this construction. In Gothic there are two forms of expression here. The first form employs the vocative in order to preserve the exact form of direct address: "apþan hwa mik haitid *frauþa*, *frauþa*?" κύριε κύριε "Why do you call me, Lord, Lord?" (Luke, 6.46). The form *frauþa* is undoubtedly a vocative just as the Greek κύριε, but unfortunately the noun is weak and this declension does not have a distinct vocative form. Clear vocative forms occur very frequently in the Gothic Bible, but there is not a single case occurring in this construction, as the nouns employed are all weak. Altho the vocative form is not clear here, the repetition of the word *frauþa* and the whole setting of the utterance clearly show that the intention is to reproduce the exact form of direct address. Modern German, in spite of its loss of the vocative case, has preserved this form quite perfectly: "Er nannte sie *mein lieber Schatz*, *mein Engelchen*, *mein Kind*" (Hölty). We see by the use of the nominative *mein lieber Schatz* that the intention is to preserve the exact form of direct address. The second Gothic form is the declarative or predicative form, the use of the nominative to impart to the word the force of a declaration or a predication: "jus woþeid mik: *laisareis jah frauþa* ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος) "You call me master and Lord" (John, 13.13). It is evident at a glance that this form is distinct from the first one. In the Greek the nominative (ὁ διδάσκαλος and ὁ κύριος) is used instead of the vocative (κύριε)

of the first form. Likewise, we have in the Gothic the nominatives *laisareis* and *frauja*. There is here evidently no attempt to preserve the exact form of direct address. The vocative *laisari* is one of the commonest expressions in the Gothic gospels, constantly appearing in direct address. Here this word appears as *laisareis* in nominative form. The explanation lies in the next words of the text: "waila qipip, im ik" "and you speak well, for so I am." Thus the nominative has the force of a predication. The language here is finely framed in the Greek and accurately rendered by Wulfila. This is good Gothic, not an imitation of the Greek as represented by Professor Streitberg. This same form is nicely preserved in modern German: "Nicht ohne Grund habe ich ihn schon: Philipp, der Schweigsame, genannt" (Spielhagen's "Freigeboren," p. 225). The nominative here and in all such expressions is the usual form of declarative statement. It has already in Gothic become the fixed unalterable name by which a person or thing goes. Hence, this nominative is not only used after verbs, but after nouns: "jah gasatida Seimona namo *Paitrus*" (Πέτρον "Und gab Simon den Namen Petrus" (Mark 3.16). In the Greek we find the accusative here in accordance with usage in the older languages, which required the strict grammatical agreement of the appositive with the governing word. Wulfila's use of the nominative here is very interesting, for it is the first case of this usage in the Germanic family as Gothic is the oldest Germanic language. Later the Germanic languages all show this usage. In Latin it had long before Wulfila's time been gradually growing more frequent. The universal trend was toward this usage. On page 173 of Professor Streitberg's "Gotische Bibel" he remarks on this construction: "zum Nominativ vgl. bedf ff' g' il vg." If he simply means to call attention here to the similar development in the Latin versions of the Bible the remark is perfectly in place, but if the intention is to suggest Latin influence upon Wulfila or the thought of interpolation by others, the remark is to be rejected. We have to do here with a natural development and a universal movement. Wulfila deviated from the Greek usage

as the new nominative construction seemed more natural to him. It is a little point, but to the writer it aptly illustrates Wulfila's careful regard for his own native idiom.

On page 157 of his Gothic Grammar Professor Streitberg remarks that Wulfila's accusative of specification or respect is the result of Greek influence. It seems quite sure, however, that it is good Gothic, as Wulfila uses it independently of the Greek: "jah *haubiþ* wundan brahtedun" (Mark, 12.4) (*κεφαλáιωσαν*) "And they wounded him in the head." The Gothic accusative corresponds to a verb in the Greek. We find another Gothic example, which is independent of the Greek: "*þimait* ahtaudogs" (Phil. 3.5) (*περιτομῇ*) "eight days old when circumcised," literally "as to circumcision eight days old." The Greek uses here the dative of specification instead of the usual accusative. As the accusative of specification is common in Greek and is freely used in early Latin with pronouns in such forms as *id*, *istuc*, *aliud*, *quid*, etc., and is also occasionally found in other Indo-European languages, it seems quite probable that it was in limited use in Indo-European. Thus Gothic preserves here a real old usage. Later the genitive of specification replaced the accusative here in all the Germanic languages. The genitive is already in the Gothic more common here.

A very suspicious Gothic construction occurs in John 17.26: "jah kannja ei *friþwa þoei frijodes mik*, in im sijai jah ik in im" (*ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησας ἡς*) "And I will declare it that the love which thou cherished for me may be in them and I in them." In an earlier draft of this article this construction was represented as the result of Greek influence. It seems at first to be something quite foreign to the Germanic languages. After a long and careful study the conviction has come that it is good Gothic and represents one of the oldest constructions in the language. There is in this construction a double accusative. In Indo-European a double accusative was not as uncommon as in modern languages. Both a person and a thing can be involved in an action and hence there can be two direct objects. We can today feel this old construction only in a very small

number of verbs. In "Er lehrte mich das Latein" we can clearly see that "Er lehrte mich" and "Er lehrte das Latein." We lose all feeling for the construction when we use another verb than *lehren*. In German even with this verb the dative of the person has in recent literature largely replaced the old accusative: "Wie die blonde Lotsentochter ihm, dem steifen Nordschleswiger das English und das Küssen lehrte." (Frennsen's "Hilligenlei," chap. 10.) In the English sentence "He taught me Latin" the *me* is also a dative. In modern German the feeling is strongly pronounced that if a person is in any way involved in an action his material, moral or emotional interests are involved and that the noun representing the person ought to be in the dative, the dative of interest." The German still employs also the accusative of the person with the verb *lehren* and a few others, but when some other verb outside of this little list is used the old construction with the double accusative is replaced by some other form of expression. Otfrid's *thaz ni hilu(i)h thiñ* (II. 19.23) "must now be rendered by "Das verhehle ich *dir* nicht." Instead of the old double accusative we now have a dative and an accusative. The new type dative-accusative is now the usual form of expression. It is difficult for us today to approach Otfrid's sentence with any feeling. It means nothing to us at all. Now let us return to Wulfila's sentence. It seems as foreign to us as Otfrid's, but it does not seem more foreign. Wulfila found this form in the Greek and he could do what we cannot do—he could approach it with his feeling. This type had not yet become entirely strange to him. He felt the double object: "the love *which* thou cherished" and "thou cherished *me*." In accordance with a usage still known to him he joined both objects in one sentence, "the love *which* you cherished (for) *me*." In modern English we have to insert *for* before *me*. Professor Brugmann in his "Kurze vergleichende Grammatik," page 443, regards this construction as possibly Gothic, but places a question mark after it. The present writer is quietly and firmly convinced that it is good Gothic. It is another

interesting survival of an older period which felt quite differently at this point, and as its feeling was different it used a different form. This old form was not only common in Greek, but also in *older* Latin, where we find sentences quite similar to the Gothic passage under consideration: "victores palmas et coronas argenteas honoraverunt." (Act. fratr. arval Corp., p. 550, 7.) On page 359 of Schmalz's "Lateinische Grammatik" other interesting examples are given from early Latin. Later the construction rapidly decayed in Latin, as well as in the Germanic languages. Wulfila's sentence seems quite unnatural when studied from our modern point of view, but it becomes natural when studied in connection with the other older languages. Gothic is the oldest Germanic language and a close study of this particular Gothic construction shows clearly that its age is plainly indicated by its syntax as well as by its phonology and inflectional systems. Elsewhere in the Bible Wulfila seems to avoid such double accusatives. It seems quite evident that Gothic in general had the same unfavorable attitude toward this construction that characterized Latin and all the Germanic languages. He used the double accusative with "laisjan" *to teach*, also with "bidjan" *to ask* wherever the object of the thing is a neuter pronoun. Here his usage corresponds with that of the other Germanic languages: "daz er ouh gihorti, thaz ther ewarto bati" (Otfrid I., 4.18 "That he might hear what the priest was asking for." As Gothic literature is confined to a fragment of the Bible and to a few small fragments besides, we shall never know the full list of Gothic verbs which might take two accusative objects.

The Gothic genitive in the following passage from Mark 16.1 has been often discussed and has given scholars so much trouble that some have been led to suggest new conjectural readings for the text: "Jah *inwisindin(s) sabbate dagis* Marja so Magdalene jah Maria so Iakobis jah Salome usbauhtedun aromata, ei atgaggandeins gasalbodedeina ina" (διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου) "The Sabbath day being at hand, Mary Magdalene and Mary, the mother of James, and Salome bought sweet spices

that they might come and anoint him." The Greek text is quite different. It reads: "and when the Sabbath was past." The Gothic text has been changed intentionally and brought in harmony with Luke, 23.56. In Mark it is said in the Greek version that they bought the spices after the Sabbath had passed. Such an alteration in the direction of a clear, consistent text would be quite consistent with Wulfila's procedure in a number of other passages elsewhere, as, for instance, in Matth. 27.64, where he changes a superlative to a comparative to bring the statement in harmony with the facts. The thought of the Gothic translator seems perfectly clear, but there is some doubt about the form and its syntactical relation. In the manuscript there is an omission of an *s* at the end of the present participle *inwisindin(s)*. The ending of the noun *dagis*, however, clearly shows that the case is the genitive. Some who cannot explain the genitive here propose to amend the genitive to a dative, which is the case that Wulfila usually employs in such absolute constructions. Others hesitating to amend the text try to explain it. In the Greek the construction is the absolute genitive. Most scholars think that Wulfila did not imitate the Greek here, for he does not a single time elsewhere imitate this very common Greek construction. Grimm and others explain the genitive here as a genitive of time. The writer has quite exhausted his brain in trying to think how such distinguished scholars could agree that this is a genitive of time. The passage would then mean: "On the Sabbath day, which was at hand, they bought the spices." It is, however, not possible to assume that they bought the spices on the Sabbath, for we know that this is not the Jewish custom, and besides, this rendering puts the text out of harmony with both Mark and Luke. The writer thinks this is an absolute genitive, in spite of the fact that this genitive does not occur elsewhere. It is scarcely an imitation of the Greek, for Wulfila regularly thruout the Bible renders this very common construction by some other case. The natural case here would be the dative. A close study of Wulfila's language shows that there is a tend-

ency toward the use of the dative in the absolute construction, but also the nominative and accusative are used here, as the construction is not firmly fixed. In two passages, Mark 6.21 and John 11.44, he uses the nominative in narrative, and the use of this case seems to have been suggested by the general impression that the nouns in the clauses were subjects. Here in Mark 16.1 we find the genitive as the general impression of time, perhaps, arose in his mind in connection with the word *day*, and the idea of time was associated with the genitive. Thus this vague impression influenced him here to employ the genitive, while other impressions influenced him to employ the nominative and accusative in other passages. Nowhere is Wulfila so much under Greek influence as in his use of the absolute constructions. He is influenced by the Greek, but he is constantly struggling against it. Every case of the common Greek construction gave him a problem to solve. He avoided the absolute construction in a number of ways. He often framed his sentences so that the words of the Greek absolute construction would in Gothic agree as appositives with some word in the sentence, or he converted the Greek absolute construction into a subordinate clause or a prepositional phrase that formed an integral part of the sentence. In a number of cases, however, he made use of the absolute construction, but in every case but one he employed some other case than the genitive of the Greek. The Greek genitive was strange to his feeling. He followed the natural instinct of a Goth in choosing here in most cases the dative, for in Germanic the feeling is well developed that a noun representing a person as involved by his interests in an action should stand in the dative. In the following sentence the dative indicates that the person in question suffered an interruption of his work by the activity of the principal verb. This interruption vaguely implies the contemporaneousness of the two activities: "*nauhþanuh imma rodjandin qemun fram þamma synagogafada*" (Mark, 5.35) "While he was yet speaking several came to him from the house of the ruler of the synagogue." In the English translation the abso-

lute construction is rendered by a subordinate clause. The old absolute construction is born of the impulse for compactness of expression, the modern impulse is for perspicuity. Also Wulfila at times employs here the subordinate clause, but the consistent use of hypotaxis had not in his day become so common as it is today. The extensive use of hypotaxis in modern languages indicates that clear and accurate thinking has become a fixed habit. It required many centuries to develop forms that would express thought accurately, and it likewise required centuries to develop the natural impulse to use these forms. In this respect German stands on a much higher plane than English. We are still usually content with saying: "*Being sick*, I staid at home," or, "*Going down the street*, I met an old friend." Present usage compels a German to say: "*Da ich krank war*, blieb ich zu Hause;" "*Als ich die Strasse hinunter ging*, traf ich einen alten Freund." In Wulfila's time accurate thinking had not become a fixed habit. In the language of the Greek Testament the loose genitive absolute abounds and Wulfila was not compelled by the fixed habits of his own race to be more accurate in his thought than were the Greek writers of the New Testament, who used a language which had been developed by the best thinkers of antiquity. Wulfila's translations of the vague Greek absolute construction show a pronounced tendency toward more accurate thinking. His imperfect work at this point shows clearly the general limitations of his time and native language rather than individual clumsiness or lack of cleverness. Wulfila makes upon us the impression of a man gifted with fine feeling and considerable language talent.

GEORGE O. CURME.

Northwestern University.